arXiv:quant-ph/9706001v1 31 May 1997

On Tracial Operator Representations of Quantum Decoherence Functionals

Oliver Rudolph [a]

II. Institut für Theoretische Physik
Universität Hamburg
Luruper Chaussee 149
D-22761 Hamburg, Germany

and

J. D. Maitland Wright [b]

Analysis and Combinatorics Research Centre
Mathematics Department
University of Reading
Reading RG6 6AX, England

ABSTRACT

A general *quantum history theory* can be characterised by the space of histories and by the space of decoherence functionals. In this note we consider the situation where the space of histories is given by the lattice of projection operators on an infinite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$. We study operator representations for decoherence functionals on this space of histories. We first give necessary and sufficient conditions for a decoherence functional being representable by a trace class operator on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$, an infinite dimensional analogue of the Isham-Linden-Schreckenberg representation for finite dimensions. Since this excludes many decoherence functionals of physical interest, we then identify the large and physically important class of decoherence functionals which can be represented, canonically, by bounded operators on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$.

[a] email: rudolph@x4u2.desy.de

[b] email: J.D.M.Wright@reading.ac.uk

1 Introduction

The consistent histories approach to quantum mechanics has attracted much interest in recent years. The consistent or decoherent histories approach to quantum theory is a fresh, novel attempt to formulate a substantial generalisation of standard quantum mechanics which, as far as the mathematical machinery is concerned, stays remarkably close to ordinary Hilbert space quantum mechanics. It introduces new concepts into quantum mechanics and is structurally different from all other approaches to quantum mechanics. It has enriched and deepened our understanding of non-relativistic quantum mechanics quite generally and in particular of the interpretation of standard Hilbert space quantum mechanics.
There is also the hope that physical general quantum history theories may be constructed in terms of the concepts of the histories approach, which generalise standard Hilbert space quantum mechanics.

The consistent histories approach to non-relativistic quantum mechanics was inaugurated in a seminal paper by Griffiths [1]. In this paper Griffiths introduced histories mainly as a tool for formulating a realistic interpretation of non-relativistic quantum mechanics. This so-called '*consistent histories interpretation*' has been further developed and brought to its present form by Omnès [2] - [5].
(In the consistent histories interpretation it is asserted that quantum mechanics provides a realistic description of individual quantum mechanical systems, regardless of whether they are open or closed and regardless of whether there is an external observer or not. Probabilities are associated with *complete* histories and are thought of as measures of *propensities* or tendencies inherent in the quantum system in question. The assignment of probabilities to histories in a certain set is only admissible when this set of histories carries the structure of a Boolean lattice and satisfies an additional so-called consistency condition.
In a series of publications Gell-Mann and Hartle [6] - [11] have studied quantum cosmology and the path integral formulation of relativistic quantum field theory in terms of the concepts of the histories approach.
However, all the above mentioned authors have stuck to the usual Hilbert space formalism (or to the usual path integral formulation) of Hamiltonian quantum mechanics or Hamiltonian quantum field theory and have in essence considered only histories which are time-sequences of single-time events (or – in the path integral formulation – classes of Feynman paths).
Further important developments and results can be found in the work of Dowker and Kent [12, 13]. Specifically, Dowker and Kent showed that certain hopes of the original Gell-Mann–Hartle programme cannot be fulfilled and that some incidental claims to be found in the early literature of the consistent histories approach cannot be upheld.
The investigation here is not affected by the negative results due to Dowker and Kent.

In an ingenious work Isham [14] has broadened both the scope and the mathematical framework of the consistent histories approach to quantum mechanics. Isham has formulated a natural algebraic generalisation of the consistent histories approach.
In his approach a general quantum history theory is characterised by the space of histories

on the one hand and by the space of decoherence functionals on the other hand. In Isham's approach histories are identified with the general temporal properties of the quantum system or in a somewhat different language with the *temporal events*. In general these temporal events or histories are more general objects than simply time-sequences of single-time events but must be regarded as events intrinsically spread out in time. Histories are regarded as fundamental entities in their own right.
Isham's approach has subsequently become the subject of intense study. The reader is referred to the original articles by Isham and Linden [15, 16, 17], by Isham, Linden and Schreckenberg [18], by Schreckenberg [19, 20, 21], by Isham [22], by Pulmannová [23], and by the present authors [24, 25, 26, 27].

Dual to the notion of history is the notion of decoherence functional. The decoherence functional determines the consistent sets of histories in the theory and the probabilities assigned to histories in the consistent sets. More specifically, a decoherence functional d maps every ordered pair of histories h, k to a complex number denoted by $d(h, k)$. The number $d(h, k)$ is interpreted in physical terms as a measure of the mutual interference of the two histories h and k. A consistent set of histories consists of histories whose mutual interference is sufficiently small, such that the diagonal value $d(h, h)$ can be interpreted as the probability of the history h in this consistent set.
In standard quantum mechanics the state of some quantum mechanical system comprises all probabilistic predictions of quantum mechanics for the system in question. This idea of the notion of the state can be carried over to general quantum history theories: it is in this sense that decoherence functionals can be said to represent the *transtemporal states* of a system described by a quantum history theory.

To get insight into the possible structure of general quantum history theories it is worthwhile to study the structure of the space of decoherence functionals for general quantum history theories in some detail. In particular it is of some interest to find operator representations for decoherence functionals. In the present work we consider the situation where that the space of histories is given by the set of projection operators on some, in general, infinite dimensional Hilbert space. This choice can be motivated by appealing to the history formulation of standard quantum mechanics as given by Isham [14].

Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ be the space of all bounded operators on a Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$ and let $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$ be the lattice of projections in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ (here $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$ is interpreted as the set of histories). Then a *decoherence functional for* $\mathfrak{H}$ is a complex valued function $d : \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H}) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H}) \to \mathbb{C}$, defined on all ordered pairs of projections in $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$, such that

(i) *Hermiticity:* $d(p, q) = d(q, p)^*$ for each p and q in $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$. (Here * denotes complex conjugation.)

(ii) *Positivity:* $d(p, p) \geq 0$ for each $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$.

(iii) *Normalisation:* $d(1, 1) = 1$.

(iv) *Orthoadditivity:* $d(p_1+p_2,q)=d(p_1,q)+d(p_2,q)$ whenever $p_1\in\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$ and $p_2\in\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$ are perpendicular and $q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$ is an arbitrary projection.

There are stronger notions of orthoadditivity which are useful:

(iv)′ *Countable Additivity:*
A decoherence functional said to be *countably additive* if, whenever $\{p_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a countable collection of pairwise orthogonal projections, for each $q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$,

$$d\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}p_i,q\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}d(p_i,q).$$

Here the series on the right hand side is rearrangement invariant and hence is absolutely convergent.

(iv)″ *Complete Additivity:*
A decoherence functional is said to be *completely additive* if, whenever $\{p_i\}_{i\in I}$ is an infinite collection of pairwise orthogonal projections,

$$d\left(\sum_{i\in I}p_i,q\right)=\sum_{i\in I}d(p_i,q),$$

for each $q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$. Here the convergence is always absolute.

When $\mathfrak{H}$ is finite dimensional and of dimension greater than two, it follows from Isham, Linden and Schreckenberg [18] that for each bounded decoherence functional d on $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})\times\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$ there is a canonical operator $\mathfrak{X}$ on $\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}$ such that, for all $p,q\in\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$

$$d(p,q)=\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}\left((p\otimes q)\mathfrak{X}\right). \tag{1}$$

The properties (i), (ii) and (iii) of decoherence functionals imply:

(i) $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}\left((p\otimes q)\mathfrak{X}\right)=\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}\left((q\otimes p)\mathfrak{X}^*\right)$;

(ii) $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}\left((p\otimes p)\mathfrak{X}\right)\geq 0$;

(iii) $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}(\mathfrak{X})=1$.

Conversely, given any operator $\mathfrak{X}$ on the finite dimensional space $\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}$ which satisfies (i), (ii), and (iii), there is a unique decoherence functional given by (1), see [18].

Our aim here is to investigate to what extent the representation (1) remains valid when $\mathfrak{H}$ is infinite dimensional. If (1) is to hold for all p and q in $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$, then $\mathfrak{X}$ must be a trace class operator. Moreover d must be bounded and completely additive. It would be pleasing if these conditions were sufficient to imply the existence of a trace class operator which satisfies (1). Unfortunately this is false, since there are physically natural examples of 'well-behaved' decoherence functionals for which (1) fails. On the other hand we shall show that it is possible to generalise the representation (1) to infinite dimensions precisely when d satisfies a sufficiently

strong boundedness condition (*tensor boundededness*).

Since many decoherence functionals of physical interest are not tensor bounded and hence not representable by trace class operators, we then identify the large and physically important class of decoherence functionals which can be represented, canonically, by bounded operators on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$. These are the *tracially bounded* decoherence functionals. We shall see that to each tracially bounded decoherence functional d there corresponds a unique bounded linear operator $\mathfrak{M}$ on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ such that, whenever p and q are projections with finite dimensional range,

$$d(p,q) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H})}((p \otimes q)\mathfrak{M}). \tag{2}$$

In general, $\mathfrak{M}$ is not of trace class and the formula (2) has no meaning for projections of infinite dimensional range. But, when d is also countably additive and $\mathfrak{H}$ is separable, (2) can be used to calculate d. For, given p and q in $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$, each of them can be written as a countable sum of orthogonal projections of finite rank, $p = \sum_i p_i$ and $q = \sum_j q_j$ and we find that

$$d(p,q) = d\left(\sum_i p_i, \sum_j q_j\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}\left((p_i \otimes q_j)\mathfrak{M}\right). \tag{3}$$

When $\mathfrak{H}$ is not separable analogous results hold if d is completely additive.

Throughout this work we denote the inner product on a Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$ by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and we adopt the convention that the inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is linear in the first variable and conjugate linear in the second variable.

2 Bounded decoherence functionals

A decoherence functional $d : \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H}) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H}) \to \mathbb{C}$ is said to be *bounded* if the set of real numbers $\{|d(p,q)| : p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H}), q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})\}$ is bounded.

In the sequel we will make use of the following theorem which is a special case of a more general result proved in Wright [24].

Theorem 2.1 *Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be a Hilbert space which is either infinite dimensional or of finite dimension greater than two. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$ be the lattice of projections on $\mathfrak{H}$. Then a decoherence functional d can be extended (uniquely) to a bounded bilinear form $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) \to \mathbb{C}$ if, and only if, d is bounded.*

By setting $\mathfrak{Q}(x,y) = \mathcal{D}(x,y^*)$ we can replace bilinear forms on $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})\times\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ by sesquilinear forms on $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$. An immediate consequence of Theorem 2.1 is that bounded decoherence functionals for $\mathfrak{H}$ (where $\mathfrak{H}$ is not of dimension 2) are in one-to-one correspondence with those bounded Hermitian forms $\mathfrak{Q}$ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ for which $\mathfrak{Q}(1,1) = 1$ and $\mathfrak{Q}(p,p) \geq 0$ for all projections p; see [24].

3 Bilinearity and linearity: Isham-Linden-Schreckenberg representability

Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be a Hilbert space and let $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$ be the ideal of compact operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$. Then $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ if, and only if, $\mathfrak{H}$ is finite dimensional.

We shall need some basic facts on tensor products of operator algebras. For a particularly elegant account, from first principles, of tensor products of C^*-algebras see Wegge-Olsen [28] and, for a more advanced treatment, see Kadison and Ringrose [29].

Let us recall that if $\mathfrak{H}$ is a Hilbert space, the algebraic tensor product $\mathfrak{H} \otimes_{alg} \mathfrak{H}$ can be equipped with an inner product such that $\langle h_1 \otimes f_1, h_2 \otimes f_2 \rangle = \langle h_1, h_2 \rangle \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$. The completion of $\mathfrak{H} \otimes_{alg} \mathfrak{H}$ with respect to this inner product is the Hilbert space tensor product $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$. When x and y are bounded operators on $\mathfrak{H}$, then there is a unique operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H})$, denoted by $x \otimes y$, such that $(x \otimes y)(h \otimes f) = x(h) \otimes y(f)$ for all h and f in $\mathfrak{H}$.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be C^*-algebras of operators acting on $\mathfrak{H}$, then the *algebraic tensor product* $\mathcal{A} \bullet \mathcal{B}$ can be identified with the * algebra, acting on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$, which consists of all finite sums of operators of the form $A \otimes B$, with $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$. The norm closure of $\mathcal{A} \bullet \mathcal{B}$ is the *C^*-tensor product of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$* and is denoted by $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$. (This is also called the spatial C^*-tensor product to distinguish it from other possible C^*-tensor products; see [28].) When $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are von Neumann algebras of operators acting on $\mathfrak{H}$, then the closure of $\mathcal{A} \bullet \mathcal{B}$ in the weak operator topology of $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H})$ is the *von Neumann tensor product of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$*, denoted by $\mathcal{A} \overline{\otimes} \mathcal{B}$.

The algebraic tensor product $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$ embeds naturally into $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ which, in turn embeds naturally into $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) \overline{\otimes} \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H})$ (see for instance Kadison and Ringrose [29], Chapter 11.2.). This embedding of $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H})$ induces a (unique) pre-C^*-norm on $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$. The (spatial) C^*-tensor product $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \otimes \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$ is the closure of $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H})$ with respect to this pre-C^*-norm and can be identified with $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H})$.

Let d be a bounded decoherence functional for $\mathfrak{H}$, where $\mathfrak{H}$ is not of dimension two. Then, by Theorem 2.1, d has a unique extension to a bounded bilinear form $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $d(p, q) = \mathcal{D}(p, q)$ for all p and q in $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$.

Let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}}$ the restriction of $\mathcal{D}$ to $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \times \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$. Then, by the fundamental property of the algebraic tensor product there is a unique linear functional $\beta : \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\beta(x \otimes y) = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}}(x, y) = \mathcal{D}(x, y), \tag{4}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$. In particular $d(p, q) = \beta(p \otimes q)$ for all projections p and q in $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$.

Definition *The decoherence functional d is said to be* tensor bounded *if the associated functional β is bounded on $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$, when $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$ is equipped with its unique pre-C^*-norm.*

Lemma 3.1 *Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be an arbitrary Hilbert space. Let ϕ be a bounded linear functional on $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$. Then* (1) *there exists a unique trace class operator T in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ such that, for each $z \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$,*

$$\phi(z) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}}(zT).$$

Furthermore (2)*, there is a unique extension of ϕ to an ultraweakly continuous functional $\widetilde{\phi}$ on $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ such that, for each $z \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$,*

$$\widetilde{\phi}(z) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}}(zT).$$

Proof: For (1) see [30], page 63, or [31], page 48, Theorem 3 and for (2) see [29], Vol. II, page 749. □

Theorem 3.2 *Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be a Hilbert space which is not of dimension two. Let d be a bounded decoherence functional for $\mathfrak{H}$. Then d is tensor bounded if, and only if, there exists a trace class operator $\mathfrak{X}$ on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ such that*

$$d(p,q) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}((p \otimes q)\mathfrak{X}) \tag{5}$$

for all projections p and q in $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{D}$ be the bounded bilinear form corresponding to d and let β be the associated linear functional on the algebraic tensor product $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$.

Let $\mathfrak{X}$ be a trace class operator which implements (5). Let $\phi(z) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}(z\mathfrak{X})$ for $z \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$. Then $\phi(x \otimes y) = \mathcal{D}(x,y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$. Since, by the fundamental property of the algebraic tensor product, β is the unique functional with this property, it coincides with ϕ. So β is bounded.

Conversely, suppose that d is tensor bounded. Then, by definition, β is bounded. So it has a unique extension to a bounded linear functional $\widetilde{\beta}$ on $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H})$, the norm closure of $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})\bullet\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$. By Lemma 3.1(1) there exists a trace class operator $\mathfrak{X}$ on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ such that

$$d(p,q) = \mathcal{D}(p,q) = \beta(p \otimes q) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}((p \otimes q)\mathfrak{X}),$$

for all projections $p, q \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$. □

Corollary 3.3 *Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be a Hilbert space which is not of dimension two. Let d be completely additive. There exists a trace class operator $\mathfrak{X}$ on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ such that*

$$d(p,q) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}\left((p \otimes q)\mathfrak{X}\right), \tag{6}$$

for all projections p, q in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ if, and only if, d is tensor bounded.

Proof: When there exists a trace class operator $\mathfrak{X}$ such that (6) holds, then, by Theorem 3.2, d is tensor bounded.
Conversely, when d is tensor bounded, the existence of $\mathfrak{X}$ such that (6) holds for all projections of finite rank is guaranteed by Theorem 3.2. By appealing to the complete additivity of d and the ultraweak continuity of the map $z \mapsto \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}(z\mathfrak{X})$ it is straightforward to establish (6) for arbitrary projections. □

Corollary 3.4 *Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be a Hilbert space which is not of dimension two. There is a one-to-one correspondence between completely additive, tensor bounded decoherence functionals d for $\mathfrak{H}$ and trace class operators $\mathfrak{X}$ on $\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}$ according to the rule*

$$d(p,q) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}\left((p\otimes q)\mathfrak{X}\right), \tag{7}$$

for all projections $p, q \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$ with the restriction that

- $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}\left((p\otimes q)\mathfrak{X}\right) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}\left((q\otimes p)\mathfrak{X}^*\right)$;
- $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}((p\otimes p)\mathfrak{X}) \geq 0$;
- $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}(\mathfrak{X}) = 1$.

Proof: Straightforward. □

Remark The Isham-Linden-Schreckenberg Theorem follows immediately since, when $\mathfrak{H}$ is finite dimensional, $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \otimes \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})\overline{\otimes}\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H})$ which is finite dimensional and every linear functional on a finite dimensional normed space is bounded.

This note is concerned with how far the Isham-Linden-Schreckenberg Theorem can be extended to infinite dimensions. Let d be a bounded decoherence functional for $\mathfrak{H}$ where $\mathfrak{H}$ has dimension greater than two. Let us call d *Isham-Linden-Schreckenberg-representable* (or, more shortly, *ILS-representable*) if there exists a trace class operator $\mathfrak{X} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H})$ such that

$$d(p,q) = \beta(p\otimes q) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}((p\otimes q)\mathfrak{X}),$$

for all projections $p, q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$. It follows from the results given above that a completely additive decoherence functional d is ILS-representable if, and only if, it is tensor bounded.

It would be pleasing if all countably additive decoherence functionals for $\mathfrak{H}$ (for $\mathfrak{H}$ separable and infinite dimensional) were ILS-representable. This is very far from the truth. The following example shows that there are very natural, 'well-behaved' decoherence functionals which are not ILS-representable.

Example 3.5 *Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be a separable, infinite dimensional Hilbert space. Let ψ be a unit vector in $\mathfrak{H}$. Let $B_\psi : \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) \to \mathbb{C}$ be defined by*

$$B_\psi(x,y) := \langle x\psi, y^*\psi\rangle$$

and let d_ψ be the (bounded) countably additive decoherence functional obtained by restricting B_ψ to pairs of projections in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$. Then d_ψ is not ILS-representable.

Proof: As remarked above, there is a unique linear functional $\beta_\psi : \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $B_\psi(x, y) = \beta_\psi(x \otimes y)$ for each x and y. By Proposition 0 in [32] β_ψ is not bounded. Thus d is not tensor bounded and so d is not ILS-representable. $\square$

It was shown in [32] that, for each $S \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$,

$$\beta_\psi(S) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \langle S(\psi \otimes \psi_i), \psi_i \otimes \psi \rangle ,$$

where $\{\psi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an orthonormal basis for $\mathfrak{H}$ with $\psi_1 = \psi$. Let U be the unitary on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ which maps $\psi_i \otimes \psi_j$ to $\psi_j \otimes \psi_i$, for each i, j. Let P be the projection on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ whose range is spanned by $\{\psi \otimes \psi_i : i = 1, 2...\}$. Then $\beta_\psi(S) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle SPU(\psi_i \otimes \psi_j), (\psi_i \otimes \psi_j) \rangle$. Hence, when S is of trace class, $\beta_\psi(S) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}}(SPU)$. So, see [30] p. 320, when S is positive

$$|\beta_\psi(S)| \leq \|PU\| \ \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}}(S).$$

It follows that β_ψ is bounded on the rank one projections in $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$.

Remark: Although $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle PU(\psi_i \otimes \psi_j), (\psi_i \otimes \psi_j) \rangle$ converges and has the value one, PU is not of trace class because $PU(PU)^* = P$, where P is a projection of non-finite rank.

4 Tracially bounded decoherence functionals

In this section we consider a much larger class of decoherence functionals than those which are ILS-representable. As before, $\mathfrak{H}$ is a Hilbert space of dimension (finite or infinite) greater than two. Let d be a bounded decoherence functional defined on $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H}) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$. Let $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H}) \to \mathbb{C}$ be the unique bounded bilinear form which extends d. Let β be the unique linear functional on $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$ such that

$$\beta(x \otimes y) = \mathcal{D}(x, y)$$

for all x and y in $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$.

Before defining tracial boundedness, we introduce some notation. Let $\mathfrak{V}$ be a Hilbert space and ξ a unit vector in $\mathfrak{V}$. Then the (rank one) projection from $\mathfrak{V}$ onto the one dimensional subspace spanned by ξ, will be denoted by p_ξ. Thus $p_\xi(\eta) = \langle \eta, \xi \rangle \xi$ for each $\eta \in \mathfrak{V}$. We observe that if α, γ are in $\mathfrak{H}$, then $p_{\alpha \otimes \gamma} = p_\alpha \otimes p_\gamma$. We may identify $\mathfrak{H} \otimes_{alg} \mathfrak{H}$ with the dense subspace of $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ consisting of those vectors which are finite sums of elementary tensors. When ξ is in $\mathfrak{H} \otimes_{alg} \mathfrak{H}$, then p_ξ is in $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$.

Definition *The decoherence functional d is said to be* tracially bounded *if it is bounded and, when β is the corresponding linear functional on $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$, there exists a constant C such that, for each unit vector ξ in $\mathfrak{H} \otimes_{alg} \mathfrak{H}$, $|\beta(p_\xi)| \leq C$.*

It is clear that the decoherence functional d_ψ considered in Example 3.5 is tracially bounded. Hence tracial boundedness is a strictly weaker condition than tensor boundedness.

The following technical lemma must be well know but, since we do not know of a convenient reference, an argument is supplied for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a bounded operator on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ such that, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{H}$,*

$$\langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha \otimes \beta), \alpha \otimes \beta \rangle = 0.$$

Then $\mathcal{L} = 0$.

Proof: Let $\Phi(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) = \langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha \otimes \beta), \gamma \otimes \delta \rangle$. So Φ is linear in the first two variables and conjugate linear in the third and fourth variables and

$$\Phi(\alpha, \beta, \alpha, \beta) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{H}. \tag{i}$$

On replacing α in (i) by $\alpha + \alpha'$ and expanding, using the linearity in the first variable and the conjugate linearity in the third variable, we obtain, after applying the identity (i) to two of the terms,

$$\Phi(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta) + \Phi(\alpha', \beta, \alpha, \beta) = 0. \tag{ii}$$

On replacing α by $i\alpha$ in (ii) we obtain

$$i\Phi(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta) - i\Phi(\alpha', \beta, \alpha, \beta) = 0.$$

So

$$\Phi(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta) = 0. \tag{iii}$$

We replace β by $\beta + \beta'$ in (iii), expand, and apply (iii) to two of the terms, obtaining

$$\Phi(\alpha, \beta', \alpha', \beta) + \Phi(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta') = 0. \tag{iv}$$

On replacing β' by $i\beta'$ in (iv), dividing by i and subtracting the result from (iv) we obtain

$$0 = \Phi(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta') = \langle \mathcal{L}(\alpha \otimes \beta), \alpha' \otimes \beta' \rangle.$$

Hence $\langle \mathcal{L}\xi, \eta \rangle = 0$ for all ξ, η in $\mathfrak{H} \otimes_{alg} \mathfrak{H}$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is bounded, this implies that $\mathcal{L} = 0$. $\square$

Proposition 4.2 *Let $\mathfrak{H}$ be a Hilbert space of dimension greater than two and let $d : \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H}) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H}) \to \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded decoherence functional for $\mathfrak{H}$. Then there exist families of trace class operators $\{\mathfrak{X}_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{\mathfrak{Y}_i\}_{i \in I}$ on $\mathfrak{H}$, where, for each x and y in $\mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$, $\sum_{i \in I} |\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}}(x\mathfrak{X}_i)|^2$ and $\sum_{i \in I} |\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}}(y\mathfrak{Y}_i)|^2$ are convergent and, for all $S \in \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H}) \bullet \mathcal{K}(\mathfrak{H})$,*

$$\beta(S) = \sum_{i \in I} \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}} \left(S \left(\mathfrak{X}_i \otimes \mathfrak{X}_i^* - \mathfrak{Y}_i \otimes \mathfrak{Y}_i^* \right) \right), \tag{8}$$

where the infinite series is absolutely convergent.

Proof: This is an easy consequence of Theorem 6 in [32]. □

In the following we shall now suppose that $\mathfrak{H}$ is separable. All our results can be extended to general Hilbert spaces but the notation becomes simpler and more transparent when $\mathfrak{H}$ is separable.

Let d, β be as in Proposition 4.2 and let ξ be a unit vector in $\mathfrak{H} \otimes_{alg} \mathfrak{H}$. So ξ is a finite sum of simple tensors $\alpha_i \otimes \beta_i$, where each α_i and β_i is in $\mathfrak{H}$. Then Proposition 4.2 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(p_\xi) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}} \left(p_\xi \left(\mathfrak{X}_i \otimes \mathfrak{X}_i^* - \mathfrak{Y}_i \otimes \mathfrak{Y}_i^*\right)\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \left(\mathfrak{X}_i \otimes \mathfrak{X}_i^* - \mathfrak{Y}_i \otimes \mathfrak{Y}_i^*\right) \xi, \xi \right\rangle . \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Let us now assume that d is tracially bounded. Then, using (9) and polarisation, we find that there exists a constant C such that

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \left(\mathfrak{X}_i \otimes \mathfrak{X}_i^* - \mathfrak{Y}_i \otimes \mathfrak{Y}_i^*\right) \xi, \eta \right\rangle \right| \leq C \ ||\xi|| \ ||\eta||$$

for all ξ, η in $\mathfrak{H} \otimes_{alg} \mathfrak{H}$.
It follows from this that there is a bounded linear operator $\mathfrak{M}$ on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ such that

$$\langle \mathfrak{M}\xi, \eta \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left\langle \left(\mathfrak{X}_i \otimes \mathfrak{X}_i^* - \mathfrak{Y}_i \otimes \mathfrak{Y}_i^*\right) \xi, \eta \right\rangle$$

for all ξ, η in $\mathfrak{H} \otimes_{alg} \mathfrak{H}$. In particular, for α and γ unit vectors in $\mathfrak{H}$,

$$\beta\left(p_\alpha \otimes p_\gamma\right) = \beta\left(p_{\alpha\otimes\gamma}\right) = \langle \mathfrak{M}(\alpha \otimes \gamma), \alpha \otimes \gamma \rangle = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}(\mathfrak{M} p_{\alpha\otimes\gamma}) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}(\mathfrak{M}(p_\alpha \otimes p_\gamma)).$$

Hence, by orthoadditivity, when p and q are projections of finite rank on $\mathfrak{H}$

$$d(p, q) = \beta(p \otimes q) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}} \left(\mathfrak{M}(p \otimes q)\right).$$

Proposition 4.3 *Let the decoherence functional d be tracially bounded. Then there exists a unique bounded linear operator $\mathfrak{M}$ on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ such that*

$$d(p, q) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}} \left(\mathfrak{M}(p \otimes q)\right) \tag{10}$$

whenever p and q are finite rank projections on $\mathfrak{H}$.

Proof: The preceding argument establishes the existence of $\mathfrak{M}$ with the required properties. If $\widehat{\mathfrak{M}}$ also satisfies (10), then, for all α and β in $\mathfrak{H}$,

$$\left\langle \left(\mathfrak{M} - \widehat{\mathfrak{M}}\right)(\alpha \otimes \beta), \alpha \otimes \beta \right\rangle = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}\left(\left(\mathfrak{M} - \widehat{\mathfrak{M}}\right) p_{\alpha\otimes\beta}\right) = 0.$$

Hence, by Lemma 4.1, $\mathfrak{M} - \widehat{\mathfrak{M}} = 0$. □

Let us recall that each projection in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{H})$ is the sum of an orthogonal family of rank one projections.

Theorem 4.4 *Let d be a countably additive, tracially bounded decoherence functional for $\mathfrak{H}$, where $\mathfrak{H}$ is separable and of dimension greater than two. Then there exists a unique bounded linear operator $\mathfrak{M}$ on $\mathfrak{H} \otimes \mathfrak{H}$ such that, whenever p and q are projections in $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$ and $\{p_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{q_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are, respectively, orthogonal families of finite rank projections with $p = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} p_n$ and $q = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} q_n$, then*

$$d(p,q) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{H}\otimes\mathfrak{H}}\left((p_i \otimes q_j)\mathfrak{M}\right). \tag{11}$$

Proof: The countable additivity of d and Proposition 4.3 imply the existence of a unique bounded linear operator $\mathfrak{M}$ satisfying (11). □

When $\mathfrak{H}$ is infinite dimensional, it follows from [25] that when $\mathfrak{H}$ is separable every countably additive decoherence functional on $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$ is bounded and, when $\mathfrak{H}$ is not separable, every completely additive decoherence functional on $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$ is bounded. By contrast, unbounded ('countably additive') decoherence functionals exist on $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{H})$ whenever $\mathfrak{H}$ is of finite dimension greater than one [25].

When $\mathfrak{H}$ is not separable, then, provided d is completely additive, the obvious analogue of (11) holds.

References

[1] **R.B. Griffiths**, J. Stat. Phys. **36**, 219 (1984).

[2] **R. Omnès**, J. Stat. Phys. **53**, 893 (1988); *ibid.* **53**, 933 (1988); *ibid.* **53**, 957 (1988); *ibid.* **57**, 357 (1989).

[3] **R. Omnès**, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **201**, 354 (1990).

[4] **R. Omnès**, Rev. Mod. Phys. **64**, 339 (1992).

[5] **R. Omnès**, *The Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton University Press, 1994).

[6] **M. Gell-Mann and J.B. Hartle**, in: *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on High Energy Physics, Singapore, August 2-8, 1990*, 1303, edited by K.K. Phua and Y. Yamaguchi (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990).

[7] **M. Gell-Mann and J.B. Hartle**, in: *Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics in the Light of New Technology*, 321, edited by S. Kobayashi, H. Ezawa, Y. Murayama and S. Nomura (Physical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 1990).

[8] **M. Gell-Mann and J.B. Hartle**, in: *Complexity, Entropy and the Physics of Information, Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Science of Complexity*, Vol. VIII, 425, edited by W. Zurek (Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1990).

[9] **J.B. Hartle**, in: *Quantum Cosmology and Baby Universes: Proceedings of the 1989 Jerusalem Winter School for Theoretical Physics*, 65, edited by S. Coleman, J.B. Hartle, T. Piran and S. Weinberg (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991).

[10] **J.B. Hartle**, in: *Proceedings of the 1992 Les Houches Summer School,* edited by B. Julia and J. Zinn-Justin, Les Houches Summer School Proceedings Vol. LVII (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1994).

[11] **M. Gell-Mann and J.B. Hartle**, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 3345 (1993).

[12] **F. Dowker and A. Kent**, J. Stat. Phys. **82**, 1575 (1996).

[13] **F. Dowker and A. Kent**, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3038 (1995).

[14] **C.J. Isham**, J. Math. Phys. **35**, 2157 (1994).

[15] **C.J. Isham and N. Linden**, J. Math. Phys. **35**, 5452 (1994).

[16] **C.J. Isham and N. Linden**, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 5392 (1995).

[17] **C.J. Isham and N. Linden**, *Information-entropy and the space of decoherence functions in generalised quantum theory*, preprint, Imperial/TP/95-96/63, DAMTP R96/44, quant-ph/9612035.

[18] **C.J. Isham, N. Linden and S. Schreckenberg**, J. Math. Phys. **35**, 6360 (1994).

[19] **S. Schreckenberg**, J. Math. Phys. **38**, 759 (1997).

[20] **S. Schreckenberg**, *Symmetries of Decoherence Functionals*, preprint, Imperial/TP/95-96/49, gr-qc/9607050.

[21] **S. Schreckenberg**, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 4735 (1996).

[22] **C.J. Isham**, *Topos Theory and Consistent Histories: The Internal Logic of the Set of all Consistent Sets*, Int. J. Theor. Phys. (in press).

[23] **S. Pulmannová**, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **34**, 189 (1995).

[24] **J.D.M. Wright**, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 5409 (1995).

[25] **J.D.M. Wright**, *Decoherence functionals for von Neumann quantum histories: boundedness and countable additivity*, Comm. Math. Phys. (in press).

[26] **O. Rudolph**, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **35**, 1581 (1996).

[27] **O. Rudolph,** J. Math. Phys. **37**, 5368 (1996).

[28] **N.E. Wegge-Olsen**, *K-Theory and C^*-algebras* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1993).

[29] **R.V. Kadison and J.R. Ringrose**, *Fundamentals of the Theory of Operator Algebras* Volume I & II, (Academic Press, Orlando, 1983 & 1986).

[30] **M. Takesaki**, *Theory of Operator Algebras I* (Springer, New York, 1979).

[31] **R. Schatten**, *Norm Ideals of Completely Continuous Operators*, 2nd printing, (Springer, Berlin, 1970).

[32] **J.D.M. Wright**, *Linear representations of bilinear forms on operator algebras*, Expos. Math. (in press).